

First Principles in Religion, Morals, Government, and the Economy of Life.

Vol. II.—No. 18.

Whole Number 70

The Principia

PROSPECTUS

THE BIBLE ABOLITIONIST

"To the law and to the testimony: If they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them." Isa. viii 20. "All Scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for correction, for instruction in righteousness, that the man of God might be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works." 1 Tim. iii 16, 17.

Part III,—Slaveholding brought directly to the test of the Bible

But the Bible speaks of stealing men, as well as of stealing their earnings.

"For indeed I was stolen away out of the land of the Hebrews."—Gen. xiv. 15.

These were the words of Joseph in Egypt, whither he had been sold by his brethren. His pursuivants had paid a stipulated sum for him, as the importers of modern slaves commonly do, in Africa. He was a stolen man, nevertheless, and all who sold, bought, or held him, were unstealers. Had the Egyptians seized all his children, and children's children, and enslaved them, for centuries, and all the long line of the Pharaohs had pretended to legalize it, they would have been un-stealers still. Who will dispute this? Or who can give a good reason why slave traders from the coast of Africa, and those to whom they sold slaves, those who held them, and those who now hold their posterity as slaves, are not mono-stealers likewise?

"And he that stealeth a man and selleth him, or if he be found in his hand, he shall surely be put to death."—Exodus, xxi. 16.

This enactment is recorded in the very next chapter to the one containing the Decalogue, and is evidently founded on the eighth commandment. If it does not forbid the seizure and sale and possession of men as slaves, under penalty of death, what is its meaning? Can it mean more than this? Could it mean less than this, without including it likewise?

Let us see how this crime was regarded by an inspired apostle.

"Knowing this that the law was not made for a righteous man but for the lawless and rebellious, for the ungodly and for sinners, for unholy and prompt for murderers of fathers and murderers of mothers, for man slayers, for whoremongers, for false swearing, for those that defile themselves with mankind, for MAN STEALERS, for those for perjured persons, and if there be any other thing that is contrary to sound doctrine, and that is the subject of this sermon, I would have you beware of it."

together the strongest epithets descriptive of extreme wickedness, as though this were necessary in order to characterize them truthfully. And, as though even this were not sufficient, they are next placed in the same catalogue with the most daring, most odious, most abominable of criminals, and so placed in the list, as to convey the impression that their peculiar crime approximated nearly or quite, to the climax of *all crime*, beyond which, the attempt to proceed further, without a descending scale, was found impracticable, and the process of specification was therefore abruptly terminated by *an et cetera* of all other crimes.

Who then, and where, are the incu stealers? To whom, in our own times, nay, in any age or nation, can this portion of God's word be applied? Let the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States, in the days of our fathers, (1794,) answer.

In a note to the one hundred and forty-second question in the larger catechism in the Confession of Faith, (a question on the eighth commandment,) was the following

“1 Tim. i. 10.—The law is made for such stealers. This crime among the Jews, subjected the perpetrators of it to capital punishment.—Exodus xvt. 16, and the apostle here classes them with sinners of the first rank. The word *hoi* comprehends all who are concerned in bringing into the world such a race of men as retaining them in it. The sinners of men are those who buy off slaves or freemen, and keep, sell, or buy them. To steal a freeman, says Grotius, is the highest kind of theft. In other instances we only steal human property, but when we steal or retain men in slavery, we seize those who, in common with ourselves, are constituted by the original grant of the earth.”—Gen. i. 28. *Vide Poli Synopson in locis.*

The following citations will show that Grotius and the Presbyterian General Assembly only expressed the views of other eminent Christians on the subject.

Dr. Porteus, Bishop of London said that the Bible "classed men-stealers, or slave catchers, among the murderers of fathers and mothers, the most profane criminals on earth."

John Wesley denominated slave dealers, "man-stealers, the worst of thieves, in comparison of whom highway robbers, and housebreakers are comparatively innocent." He adds, "And men buyers, are exactly on a level with men-stealers."

Dr. Jonathan Edwards said, "To hold a man in a state of slavery, is to be, every day, guilty of robbing him of his liberty, or of man-stealing."

Richard Baxter regarded those engaged in the slave traffic, as "pirates and robbers."

Charles James Fox said, "With regard to the regulation of slavery my detestation of its existence, induces me to know no such thing as a regulation of robbery. a restriction, of murder.

The Philadelphia Yearly meeting of Friends, at an early day, condemned slaveholding, as "promotive of man-stealing."

Other similar testimonies might be adduced, but these may suffice to show that our exposition of the eighth commandment, in its bearing on slavery, the slave trade, and slave-labour, plethorically fulfills the letter, is neither legal nor singular. *

If the eighth commandment does not forbid slaveholding how can it be proved that it forbids anything? Or what meaning connects it with the Bible use of the terms *enslaved* and *to enslave* when we give it?

If the terms, in our translation, do not express ideas that would lay hold, to what lexigrams or juriss shall we look for definitions of these?

Blackstone is cited by Noah Webster, defining the verb *To* as "to bring into the world, with intent to make that which be- comes its mother, and without his consent."

The difference between theft and robbery, is that "The thief takes the property of another privately—the robber by open force."—Blackstone. In slaveholding, the act is "by open force," but there is commonly an effort to conceal the nature of the act, by pretending that the slave gives his consent. It is therefore robbery and theft combined.

"To rob, is to take from the person of another, feloniously, forcibly, and by putting him in fear, as to rob a passenger on the road."—*Blackstone cited by Webster.* It is "to plunder." "to take away by oppression and violence." "to withhold what is due."—*Webster.*

We must supply ourselves with new Bibles, new books of juridical science and Law dictionaries, before we can find authorities for the denial that slaveholding is a breach of the eighth commandment. Those persons are "wise above what is written!"—wise above the first principles of jurisprudence,—and wise above the meaning of their own mother tongue, who deny that slaveholding is man-stealing, and that the use of a man's labor without wages is robbery or theft.

A worldly pious, a fastidious saint, a dicky one of ethics, may turn away in disgust from "the words which the Holy Ghost teacheth," when those words brand as thieves and robbers the oppressors of the poor, who use their neighbor's service without wages, who turn aside the stranger from his right, and who make merchandise of the souls and bodies of men; but so long as God lives, so long as His Word stands, so long as HIS WORD is forever settled in heaven, so long will that word call men and things by their right names, and so characterize human actions, as to make men feel his holy indignation against transgressors, and understand distinctly what the sin is, of which He calls upon them to repent, and what is their true character in His sight. Men who prefer smother and less offensive wording (*"thief"* and *"robbery"*) wherewith to characterize slaveholding, must do so without and against the authority of the blessed Bible. The eighth commandment, *"Thou shalt not steal"* will remain unweakened, uncompromised, in its bearing against the sin of slaveholding, until the laws of the moral universe pass away.

SEVENTH LETTER TO WM. H. SEWARD

S18 My previous letters have had reference to you

speech in the Senate, of January 12th. I have a word to add now, relating, more especially, to your later speech in the same body: you presenting the New York Union petition, January 30th—a copy of which, under your frank, I have the pleasure to acknowledge.

[illegible]

form, and the Republican party. But, until your speech of January 31, they have feared that your solicitude for peace with the slaveholders would induce you to allow secession in their path, and to content with them.

The portion of your late speech that displaced the former class, was that in which you say:

"A great many paritist interests are to be repressed, suppressed, and to give place,—paritist interests expressed by the Charleston platform, by the Baltimore platform, by the Chicago platform, and by the popular sovereignty platform,—which have been the cause of danger, and are to be saved; and with these interests, and with these platforms, everybody standing upon them, or connected with them, is to pass away if the Union is in danger. But I will require a very short time, if this Union is in danger and is to be saved, for all these interests and all these platforms, and all these men to disappear."

"You and I, and every one who shall oppose, resist, stand in the way of the preservation of this Union, will appear, but as mobs on a summer evening, when the wildwinds of popular indignation arise that shall be excited at the full disclosure that this Union is endangered through fiction, or even impracticability on our part."

The portion of your late speech that particularly pleased the other class of your political associates, is the following:

"It is gratifying to me to see that the proper spirit, the spirit of fraternal kindness, of conciliation and affection, is adopted by the portion of my fellow-citizens of the State to which I belong."

"I have asked them, also, in return for performing my duty on this occasion, that when they have arrived at home, they should, in the same spirit, and manifest their devotion to the Union above all other interests and all other sentiments, by speaking for the Union, by voting for the Union, and if it is demanded by leading republicans, giving their money for the Union, and fighting in the last resort for the Union, taking care that speaking goes before voting, voting goes before giving money, and so on before a battle, which I should regard as hazardous and dangerous, and therefore that it would be the most painful measure to be resorted to for the Union."

But, sir, there is another portion of your late speech that, to a large class among your fellow citizens, of whom I am one, is a most important instance than either of the preceding. It is that portion, sir, in which you repudiate, and even deride the idea of any further political action on the part of the Friends of Freedom, to prevent through the action of the Federal Government, the future extension of slavery over the vast regions of the West, comprehending, by your own showing, sufficient room for twenty-four such States as New York! Thus carrying out your proposal to cast "the Chicago platform" to the winds—with all "the interests" connected with it, for the sake of saving the Union.

Thus, sir, were your political friends divided, over your speech. The one class were indignant at your requiem of their idolized party—the other class were jubilant over your readiness to fight for the idolized Union—but neither of them mourned your repudiation of the "higher law;" your desertion of the precious rights of humanity, your proclamation of irrevocable bondage to the enslaved, your funeral knell of the liberties of your country.

I copy, sir, from your speech of January 30, which came to me under your frank, the following paragraphs:

"There has been a real, a vital question in this country for twelve years at least—a question of slavery in the Territories of the United States. It was strongest in its development in 1850, when all the Pacific States, and all the States intervening between them and the Louisiana purchase, were thrown upon our hands all of a sudden, for the purpose of our organizing them free and independent republics, giving them a number of future States. It has been an earnest, and, I regret to say, an angry controversy, but the admission of Kansas into the Union has quieted the States, and the controversy has been important in the question, leaving behind nothing but the slurs which the contest had engendered. Kansas is in the Union; California and Oregon are in the Union; and now the admission of Utah and New Mexico will put in practical operation in the Territories of the United States, just as before."

"What is the extent of the Territories which remain after the admission of the States? The Territories of the United States are: One million sixty three thousand five hundred and seven square miles, an area twenty-four times that of the State of New York, the largest of the old, and fully developed States. Twenty-four States of this size would be equal in area to the Territories with the remaining Territories of the United States. Now, under what is accepted by the Administration of the Government, it is indicated that the whole of this vast territory, operation by it, every inch of that territory is slave territory—I speak of that decision not as I accept it, but as it is accepted as the policy of the Administration. The whole of this vast territory is slave territory as much as South Carolina. Over a considerable portion of it a slave code, made by a government created by the people of the United States, is enforced; so that, according to the clause of those who have accepted the policy of the Administration of the United States for slavery, the whole of this vast territory

lion sixty three thousand square miles is slave territory. How many slaves are there in it? How many have been brought into it during these twelve years in which it has been not only relinquished to slavery, but in which the Court and the Legislature and the Administration have maintained, protected, defended, and guaranteed slavery there? Twenty-four African slaves—one slave for every forty-four thousand square miles; one slave for every one of the twenty-one States, supposing them each to be of the dimensions of New York or Pennsylvania, or Indiana, are to cover that portion of the area of our Republic, sir, I have followed this thing in good faith, with care and energy, but I confess that I have failed. Slavery now and here, in the peculiar condition of things which has existed, slavery has succeeded in planting only one slave upon every forty-four thousand square miles of territory."

"This, then, has ceased to be a practical question. In lieu of it comes up a great and vital and fearful question—the question of the dissolution of the Union, the question of the country or of no country; the question of hope, the question of greatness, or the question of sinking lower under the contempt of mankind. &c., &c."

"All we can do, sir, that 'the country' will indeed 'sink forever under the contempt of mankind' if it suffers itself to be guided by such teachings."

You failed to tell the Senate, the nation, and the world, wherein and why, the question of human freedom, through these future twenty-four States, each equal in territory and population to the State of New York, and hereafter to wield an important if not a controlling influence in the nation, is not a question as truly vital and as real, as the question that "for twelve years at least," has been an "earnest" one,—any—why and wherein it is not the selfsame question, in which it was not, determined. You failed to show why and wherein it was not as truly a "practical question" as it has hitherto been.

You did not say—and since the bloody struggle necessary to free Kansas, you could not venture to say, that climate was a sufficient safe-guard against the introduction of slavery into Nebraska and elsewhere.

What then is your argument? Why this, simply that at present, there are but twenty-four slaves, one for every one of the twenty-four embryo States. It is possible that a grave statesman can thus flippantly trifle with the question of tolerating slavery in a new country? Who does not know that there was a time when but a ship load of slaves was landed in Virginia,—and a ship load of freemen at Plymouth? Who does not know that slavery was slowly introduced into the colonies of Georgia, against the earnest opposition of Gov. Oglethorpe, and the violation of the express prohibitions of the colonial charters, instead of being protected, as you admit it is, in our Territories, by the decree of the Supreme Court "as it is accepted and enforced by the existing Administration,"—and (the country has yet to learn that that decree is to be resisted by the new Administration.) The supporters of Gov. Oglethorpe, may have been ridiculed, perhaps, for their strenuous opposition to the introduction of a mere handful of slaves. But the census of Georgia in 1860, gives us the results, namely, 467,400 slaves, to 645,336 free persons.

You sir, as a lawyer, a reader of history, and a statesman,—if I do not greatly over estimate your acquirements, know, perfectly well, that wherever law tolerates slavery to-day, it tolerates it to-morrow, next year, next decade, and next century, and so on, the validity of the tenure being commonly reckoned unquestionable, in proportion to the lapse of time, till, as Henry Clay boasted, "two centuries of legislation had sanctioned and sanctified negro slavery" in this country. You know that the permission, by the administration of Pres. Lincoln in 1861, to hold twenty-four slaves in the Territories to be divided it to twenty-four States, would be triumphantly cited to prove the validity of the enslavement of half a million or indefinitely more, in each of those States a century or two hence. You know that the permission to enslave one, is the permission to enslave more without limitation of numbers. You sir, may not remember, as I very well do, that the insignificant number of the slaves in Missouri in 1792-20, was flippantly bargained upon by the servile politicians of that day, in consideration of the inflexible opposition then made, to its admission as a slave State. Well would it have been for the country, if the pens and lips then employed, (say you a mouth there,) to expose and rebuke the flippant fallacy, could have prevailed. But they did not. And the horrible scenes in Kansas were the result. The insignificant number of the slaves in Kansas was again bargained upon, during the late struggle there. Why did not you and your associates then chime in, with the partisans of Pierce and

Bushanan, with Stringfellow, and the border ruffian, Democracy, in urging that 'filibuster's plea'?" As well might you have done it then as in your late speech.

Your evening is too rare a word for your bed, Mr. Seward. It will neither shelter you, nor hide your nakedness from the public gaze. Your speeches have not deprived you of the Secretaryship, as they should have done. But they have lost for you your reputation as a champion of freedom, throughout the civilized world, and on the page of your country's history.

Yet the influence of those speeches will not have been wholly for evil. They contain, properly studied, the very lessons that the nation, now, most needs to learn. They may be profitably studied in ages to come.

I have already enumerated and dwelt upon the important revelations of your first speech. I must now devote a brief space to an important revelation of the second.

It reveals the hollowness of the profession, or at least the impracticability of the attempt, to wield Federal power and to use National politics, to prevent the extension of slavery into New Territories and New States while conceding the constitutional right and legal validity of slavery in the States which it is to extend.

"That 'vital question of the country' for at least twelve years past" to which you have alluded; in the contesting of which you, Sir, have borne so conspicuous a part, and which you have now so ingenuously yielded up to the adversary, was unfortunately contested under that fatal concession. Your Speech of January 30th attests, either the hollowness of the profession, or, at least, the impracticability of the attempt.

To prevent the extension of slavery has been the grand struggle of at least twelve years past." The Wilnot proviso, the motto of "no more slave States"—the "exclusion of slavery from the Territories," have each had their distinct trial and each have signally and wholly failed, so far as political action was concerned. For the freedom of Kansas was conquered by the use of Sharp's rifles, in the hands of such men as John Brown,—not by Crittenden-Leocompton Compromises, nor by those who concurred to their adoption, thereby yielding up all that is now yielded up by your last speech.

When Radical Political Abolitionists pointed out the inconsistency and predicted the failure of all attempts to prevent the spread of slavery, while permitting its existence in the States,—when they exposed the ludicrous inconsistency of those who have endeavored to protect a few slaves in the Territories, while they have permitted millions of slaves in the States, you well know how the paramount importance of the Territories, the future States was magnified. Slavery in the States was to be hounded in, and starved out, by surrounding them with a cordon of free territories and free States. You know sir, how the political literature of the Republican—"The Free Soil"—and I might add—of the Whig party, previously, has abounded in this argument.

But your speech of January 30, casts all this rhetoric to the winds! The question of freedom or of slavery in the Territories so vital "for at least twelve years past" has become of no manner of significance or consequence, now! The times are changed. And whether twenty-four future States, of the size and population of New-York, are to be blessed with freedom or cursed with slavery, is a question about which the nation, its Government, and its voting citizens have nothing at all to do—any more than they have with the question of slavery in the existing slave States. It is none of their business, and need be none of their concern! So your speech leads us to infer. And with the expression of this sentiment, the leader of the Republican party in the Senate, wins his invitation—or at least, does not forfeit it—to the highest post of influence in the Republican Cabinet.

Is this, sir, the triumph of the Republican voters of 1860? Or is it their defeat? If the former, what shall be said of them? If the latter, what is their condition? And what must be the intensity of their mortification and shame?

You, Sir, very evidently, consider the Republican party disbanded, and conceive of yourself as one of the leaders of a new party, or standing on the platform of the late "Union party" that seems to have gone over to the Disunion party and left its place vacant for you. Such is undoubtedly, the fact of the case, account for it as we may

So there were 46 Republicans in favor, and 68 Republicans against the proposed amendment to the Constitution.

DISCUSSIONS ON THE CONSTITUTION, in the Chapel of the First Congregational Church, corner of South Third and Eleventh Streets, Williamsburgh.—Question for next Tuesday Evening:—Are there any parts of the Constitution that contain compromises with slavery, or that afford a tolerance and protection?

News of the Day.

Fort Sumter.—Our city was astonished on Monday morning with a rumor that Fort Sumter was to be evacuated by the Federal forces, and by order of the Administration. The Tribune's correspondent has shown that this is untrue.

WASHINGTON, March 10, 1861.—Much sensation was produced this morning by a report, which obtained currency and credit in official circles, that Major Anderson would be withdrawn from Fort Sumter. As no official action has been taken by the Administration, this rumor is not entitled to weight with the public, though it has made some impression here. It is well known that Major Anderson cannot be re-enforced without imminent danger of a serious collision. Two steamers of light draft, with supplies of food and provisions, have been ordered to leave Charleston to make the attempt whenever ordered under the command of an officer who is willing to take the risk, and feels confident of success. But the military preparations in and around the harbor render any such experiment hazardous, unless sustained by a heavy naval force, which could be used now, as the main ship channel is entirely clear of obstructions. The War Department has obtained a detailed statement of the stock of provisions in Fort Sumter, and it is abundantly clear that the stock, except in bread, which is not sufficient for over thirty days. One of the first and most important questions, therefore, before the Administration will be, whether Maj. Anderson will be supplied with provisions. That decision cannot long be postponed, for, though he now receives arms and vegetables from the markets of Charleston, this position may be cut off, at any moment, by an order from Gov. Pickens or from the rebels. Jefferson Davis has confided the direction of military operations to Gen. Beauregard.

The Tribune leads this news with—"Evacuation of Fort Sumter—Effect of delaying reinforcements—Beauregard's Perfidy"—The Tribune, editorially, said:

It is as predicted with some confidence by our Washington correspondents, Fort Sumter is to be evacuated, no doubt the humiliation will be great, and the order for such movement will be given by the Government with a reluctance equal to that with which the people will receive the thing. But let it be borne in mind that the humiliation comes. If it must come, not from any negligence or feebleness of the present Administration; that it is not an evidence of a retreat from a well-defined and strong position; that it is not a concession to the rebels; that it is not a South nor to the timid expostulations of the few in the North whose counsels are weakness; but that it is one of the last bitter drops in the cup left in our hands by the Government which has long wavered and hesitated, and which has now hardly passed out of our sight.

The people will be prepared, if this withdrawal of troops takes place, for a yell of exultation from every traitor in the land, for shouts and swelling self-congratulations from the rebels, and a loud and universal cry for reinforcements for the destruction of the Union by crying out for concessions and compromises; but let all remember that the strength has not yet departed from our flag, and that this act will be only a small step in the way of the rebels to the decisive leap, whatever it be, which they will make when aroused to its coils, compels a step which no one wishes to take—no matter if Rebellion seems to have advanced its banners, or if Treason turns more confidently toward us its eyes. The policy of the Government has been changed, and its firm foot is just as immovable as ever on the Constitution and the laws.

The Cape Codder of the Times, writes as follows:

The question of re-inforcing Fort Sumter has been under consideration in the Cabinet, and it is understood that the question whether or not it is desirable to withdraw all the troops, except two or three men, rather than in-war the blockade. The policy of the Government is to re-occupy and supplies are put in it is now to be decided.

The immediate necessity of settling this question grows out of the fact that there is only a limited supply of bread at Fort Sumter, but plenty of salt meat, and that it must either be used here, or it will be lost. The question has been under discussion in high military circles for several days.

Gen. Scott advises that reinforcements cannot now be put in without a serious risk. If the Government desires his views on the subject cannot be known, off it is, he is public, but he is understood to say that we have neither military nor naval force at hand sufficient to supply the fort in case of a threatened approach. Besides, if it should be necessary to occupy the fort, it would be necessary to initiate civil war in addition to fighting the South, and withdrawing the Union sentiment there in the waves of passion.

it would require two hundred and fifty thousand Government soldiers to carry on the struggle and a hundred millions of money to begin with. In such an event, twenty thousand men would be needed to preserve Washington and the Government archives.

The Southern Union men express the earnest hope that the Administration will pursue such a policy as will render it unnecessary to send Federal troops South. If that is not done, they say the pressure brought about by secession is pushing on a reaction in the Southern mind which will sweep the secessionists from office. They fully expect that there has an armed conflict in Texas, but prefer that it shall be between the Unionists and Disunionists of the South. All the Union men see the privilege of whipping out their

I heard distinguished secessionists confess, to-night, that Mr. Lincoln does withdraw the troops from Fort Sumter, secession is dead, and every leader in the movement ruined. The Southern Union men, however, say that the withdrawal will be misunderstood in Europe and have a bad effect there. The whole question is exceedingly embarrassing.

[The public cannot help enquiring whether the hope of killing secession will not have been a strong motive, in the Cabinet, for giving up Fort Sumter, if it should be given up.]

The N. Y. Commercial Advertiser of Monday, doubted the truth of the telegraphic dispatches, but added,

It is possible, barely possible, therefore, that yielding to the necessities of the case, the President purposes the surrender of the fort to the Southern confederacy. If so, the controversy is at an end. The situation of the Union is successful. The Southern Confederacy is a rival sovereign republic on this continent. The United States has lost tens of thousands of miles of territory, two thousand square miles, with its rich soil, its fertile lands, and its mineral wealth, all the means of defence and commerce, will be at the mercy of a foreign power, on its Southern as well as its Northern border. We use this language because Sumter will never be retaken or restored to the Union by the Federal Government, with that of Fort Pickens, is the only check upon the revolutionists. Let them once have possession of all the forts upon the gulf coast, as they would do, and the Southern Confederacy is a Government *de facto*, therefore, the Southern Union men, and the presumption that no blood must be shed to retain it. Fort Pickens must be surrendered also, on the same principle, and on the same principle a gun can never be fired or a sword drawn for the recovery of the fort or either of the forts by the Federal Government. Say we rightly then that if Fort Sumter is to be given up, the whole question is virtually settled, and the American Union, irrevocably destroyed for lack of power to maintain it?

Tuesday morning's dispatches confirmed the rumor, but without giving any official announcement. The Tribune says:

According to our Washington Correspondents, it is certain that Major Anderson's command is to be withdrawn from Fort Sumter, in accordance with the advice of Gen. Scott, who pronounces it a military necessity, and whose judgment is, of course, conclusive on such a question. To re-enforce the garrison would require an army of 100,000 men to land and drive the rebels from their intrenchments. The President has only a few hundred at his disposal, and even those cannot be spared from Washington and Fort Monroe. The rebels are not likely to be driven out of their volunteers, and the traitors in the last Administration have posed of the regular troops in such a way that those must elapse before one third of the force required to re-occupy Sumter could be concentrated on the Atlantic seaboard. Meanwhile the garrison is worn by the want of food, and if not withdrawn, it will soon be compelled by hunger to capitulate.

Washington, Monday March 11, 1861.—There is a great fever among the Republicans in the city, on account of the orders for the retirement of the troops from Fort Sumter. Every man is frenzied at the bare idea of such a thing. The act of depriving the garrison of its food, and of withdrawing it, yet it is an act in which the Cabinet are compelled to be comparatively passive. They merely follow the judgment of Gen. Scott, who advises the evacuation, and of Gen. Beauregard, who demands the surrender. The reason of its surrender must not be misunderstood. It is done wholly because it cannot now be reinforced before the supplies of the garrison are exhausted.

The rumors about Fort Pickens are being given up, are entirely unfounded. That fortress cannot be reinforced, and it will be.

An extra session of Congress is likely to be soon called, to supply the question of the last, and enable the Administration to meet the crisis. The Administration's policy will probably be to repeal the laws making parts of the seceding States ports of foreign entry, and to station National vessels there, to prevent foreign ports from

Washington, Monday March 11.—There is no longer any doubt that Mr. Anderson's command is to be withdrawn from Fort Sumter. Gen. Scott's decision is to be a military necessity, and his judgment determines the question. It is his duty to see that there is no delay.

The decision to withdraw Major Anderson naturally excites much feeling, particularly among the Western delegations. What effect it will have on the foreign negotiations, which looked to the assertion of a strong policy at all hazards, remains to be seen. Here, it is regarded as a compulsory alternative, to which Mr. Lincoln has yielded from necessity, and because he was powerless to carry out his own policy.

It is supposed, in some quarters, that the withdrawal will operate beneficially in conciliating the South, but this opinion is not shared by reflecting observers.

It is not easy to reconcile the opinions and statements made on the subject. Some writers say that the obstructions in Charleston harbor render a naval defense impracticable. Yet the British Consul lately notified his government that the obstructions were removed. When Maj. Anderson left Fort Moultrie, and went to Fort Sumter, on an island, it was said that his new position removed all elements arising from a land force of insurgents. But now, it is said that 10,000 land troops would be necessary to defend him. Up to the date of Mr. Lincoln's inauguration, it was said that provisions could easily be supplied by water, and Mr. Buchanan was blamed for not doing it. Now it is said that this cannot be done. Reason now urged against attempts to retain Fort Sumter, is that it would produce a collision, and open a civil war. When Buchanan urged the same reason he was called imbecile. Mr. Lincoln's administration, it is said, is without the support of any act of Congress authorizing and providing for the onset. So also was Mr. Buchanan's. Mr. Buchanan's policy, which was severely condemned by Republicans, was to avoid a collision at all events. Mr. Lincoln's policy essentially different in this particular?

Gov. Chase, as a member of the Cabinet, is said to be strongly opposed to the evacuation of Fort Sumter.

The Evacuation of Fort Sumter.—The Washington National Republican of Monday, contains the following paragraph concerning Fort Sumter:

"Late last evening we learned that in a Cabinet meeting on Saturday it was determined to evacuate Fort Sumter. If the news is authentic, of which we have no reason to doubt, it will be taken as a concession as one of conciliation to the border states. The fact has been taken as such, and it may have been supposed that the yielding of a point of pride to South Carolina could very well be afforded by a great government, would satisfy the country, generally, of the necessity of the policy, and enable it to stand up to the appearance of coercion, to be more stringent in the enforcement of the revenue laws."

The N. Y. Herald of Tuesday, considers the report of the evacuation of Fort Sumter a ruse, to deceive the Southerners and throw them off their guard.

Wednesday Morning's dispatches, however, go to confirm the previous accounts.

Special Dispatch to the Tribune.—Washington, Tuesday, March 12, 1861.—The withdrawal of the troops from Fort Sumter has attracted much attention here, and though the actual order for that purpose may have been issued, it is morally determined upon, and was immediately after Major Anderson's last dispatch, representing the condition of the garrison, which have been necessarily diminishing since the military operations against him commenced.

Washington, Tuesday, March 12, 1861.—The impression prevails here that the Cabinet are not in a position to issue an order for the evacuation of Fort Sumter, although, of course, nothing official is known on the subject. The best evidence to which access can be obtained leads us to believe it true.

Whatever may be the ultimate decision of the President, and his cabinet, it is evident that nothing decisive has been done as yet, and the policy is still in a state of development, though it seems to be conceded that, as a military necessity, Fort Sumter will be evacuated before the end of two weeks.

Dispatch to the Baltimore American.—Washington, Monday, March 11.—The battle of the Cabinet has been fought, and Mr. Seward has triumphed. The Cabinet has ordered the evacuation of Fort Sumter, and the evacuation from Sumter, and thus have destroyed the Southern secessionists' claim to blood the destruction of the Union.

The question of peace or war seems to have been settled in the Cabinet, to-day, in favor of the former, after a stormy session. In the opinion of the public, the evacuation of Fort Sumter is tantamount to every other concession of the Republican Party as paramount to every other concession. Something with respect to the troops at Fort Sumter had to be done, and that without delay, as official information could not be obtained. It was decided that Major Anderson could not hold his position over two weeks. The evacuation of the fort is tantamount to every other concession of the Republican Administration—reinforcement or withdrawal of the garrison.

